Anna-Maria Åström

SERVANTS AND THEIR MASTERS ON DEPENDANCE AND DISTANCE IN THE FINNISH MANORIAL SOCIETY

When the Austrian sociologist Roland Girtler in his book *"Die Feinen Leute – Von der vornehmen Art, durchs Leben zu gehen"* tried to give a description of nobility, his considerations on this subject took twenty chapters. The titles for the chapters are striking: Nobility and landownership, Rooms and escorts, Hunting, Noble symbols, Behaviour and style, Honour and worth, Celebrations, Clothes, Families and the raising of children, Sports, Weddings and Funerals.[1]

We can surely witness a symbolically and aesthetically elevated way of life where many details must find their correct place so that the impression of eminence can remain and advance. We also feel that such a way of life must find its foundations in two social conditions; the first condition being that the distinguished society, the nobility, must constitute a large enough and coherent social group to collectively maintains the culture, and the second being that this way of life cannot be maintained without the help and services of others and not just the sole primary family. This also applies to manor house societies in Finland.

Thus the primary Manor house family and their relatives occupy a position which excludes those who in day-to-day life contribute to the maintaining and reproducing of this way of life. The Manor house way of life must also always be viewed as a process; it changes during varying social circumstances, while it also rests on a grouping of ideas and ways of arranging daily life, which also strives towards permanence and a static state. On festive occasions especially, further efforts are required to reveal the distinct lifestyle and they have proven to be quite constant. The dependence on others, including the entire agricultural work-force supporting the estates' economy, as well as the servants in the houses, thus constitutes one of the pillars. This dependence can also be described from another aspect, the power relationship the family had over those that serve them.

Based on the theme of closeness and distance or dependency and distance, I will examine more theoretically the relationships taking, as a starting point the reform of country-estate life in Finland. There exists a relatively small amount of research on the subject of household servants, which I will, however, attempt to concentrate on. Considerably more research has been done on the economically interesting aspects of estate life, i.e. agriculture, care of the farm animals and the importance of the country-estate as a centre of innovation. The upper-class lifestyle is also present in many works as regards the state of Manor house architecture, interior-design, the clothing of the high-ranking and their outward conduct in life. The most celebrated researchers in Finland are, of course, our own well known professors Bo Lönnqvist and Olle Sirén, whose work I will also be relying on.[2]

---

[1] Girtler 1990.

[2] Lönnqvist 1978.; Lönnqvist 1988.; Sirén 1980.; Sirén 1985.; Sirén 2004.

I have consciously chosen these two opposite pairs of closeness and distance, as well as dependency and distance as starting points. The first pair indicates the space relationship, which could also be considered as metaphorical. The second pair focuses on the social and psychological relationship between the two parties. Through these two opposites we can try and understand the paradoxes that are particularly inherent in the relationships with household servants. Servants are needed to reproduce a daily life that includes areas such as catering, household management, cleanliness and attending to personal needs. This also involves giving instructions to the servants, both within the duties of the personal household services, as well as those occupied in the Manor house community in the more robust work of farming, tending sheep and stable work.

The paradox lies in the fact that the dependence on the servants was very great, while at the same time the distance between the categories of people was sharply accentuated during the 1800s. This relationship with servants which was being enacted in the most intimate areas of daily life required, therefore, mechanisms to both overcome and maintain a distance. The distance lessened to a certain extent, whilst at the same time it is also evident in specific cultural practices, on which it is my intention to focus.

As theoretical support I shall be relying on the anthropologist Mary Douglas thesis concerning cleanliness/ purity, and danger/ risk, as well as Pierre Bourdieu's treatment of the concept habitus.[3] Habitus describes a person's or a group's dedication to, and furthering of certain characteristics and special behavioural patterns – such as a disposition to behave in a certain manner. Via a particular lifestyle individuals create a special habitus that is indicated by the way they dress, in the styles they prefer and how they behave towards other people. I will use this concept so that in the question of Manor houses and their way of life all categories take part in the Manor house habitus and also support it in every way. At the same time the servant's habitus is also developed, however, it is somewhat secondary to the owners, although possibly in a way that is satisfactory to those in service. This dual habitus can be seen as, to use a modern word, similar to a collective project that needs to be administrated and everyone had their own role in the project- therefore each role had a function that bore a meaning in a theatre where the owners lifestyle was elevated and shaped in a process that spread lustre over everyone.

Mary Douglas's thesis on cleanliness, will in its turn, be used to observe how the transformation processes from nature to culture occurred and changed, and how natural phenomenon were also surrounded by cultural artefacts on their way back to nature. I make use of Mary Douglas because she has explicitly devoted herself to phenomena that were concerned with the management of kitchens and food, as well as the provision of personal hygiene.[4]

---

[3] Douglas 1979; Bourdieu 1979

[4] Douglas 1979. 32., 68., 126.

THE MANOR HOUSE SERVANTS

The categories of household servants in the Manor houses in Finland varied greatly during the 1800s according to the size of the Manor and the owner's wealth and contact with the "world at large". In the southern Finland's large estates there was a more elaborate system of hierarchies available, certain of which are investigated in the work Finländskt herrgårsliv edited by Bo Lönnqvist, which is mostly concerned with the estate of Karsby in Tenala.[5] Olle Sirén on the other hand has investigated the hierarchies in the large estates in Sarvlaks[6] and Malmgård.[7] As regards the eastern part of Finland I have myself researched the Manor houses around Viborg and Savolax.[8]

With regard to the female servants, it was only the relatively larger Manor houses that had one or more household keepers, with responsibility for the household's female staff, whilst most Manor houses in the centre of Finland only had a differing numbers of maid servants to serve the family. In Eastern Finland or Karelia, there were about four female servants – the housekeeper, the cook and two palour maids, in Savolax between four and five[9] and in Southern Finland eight to nine maid servants.[10] Even such small groups had a differentiation in their household tasks: cooking, childcare, and other types of household work. In Kiiskilä close to Viborg there were nine maids: a cook, two laundry maids, a housekeeper, a nanny, a wet nurse, while the remaining three had other designated tasks, such as in-house maids or serving girls. The male servants, in general, consisted of superintendents or farmhand inspectors as well as a number of farmhands. In the larger estates there was even more categories: valets, coachmen, gardeners, stable hands and gardening boys.[11]

It was in the middle of the 1800s that married individuals first appeared among those who lived on the estates. They were a category of paid agricultural workers.[12] Of all the categories mentioned it was thus only the inspectors and agricultural workers that were married and had families. One possibility for working hands (and maids) to marry was to become agricultural labourer. The salary for this category included the concept of payment with farm products, mainly cereals.[13]

The remaining individuals belonged to the expanded Manor house community that on the estates in Finland consisted of a varying number of peasants and crofters, which at the same time were included in the calculations of the size of the estate. The Manor houses were on a smaller scale, in general, than in Sweden and Denmark. Only in Nyland and Egentliga Finland, the principal Manor house regions, can the estates be compared with their Scandinavian counterparts. However, even on these Finnish smaller estates the same pattern of dependency and differentiation occurred. It is specifically because of this distancing and the distinct way of life that we

---

[5] Lönnqvist 1978.
[6] Sirén 1980. 128–134.
[7] Sirén 1985. 129–146.
[8] Åström 1977. 1993.
[9] Åström 1977. 66–68; Åström 1993. 47–48.
[10] Lönnqvist 1978. 175–176; Sirén 2004. 197
[11] Lönnqvist 1978. 177–179; Åström 1993. appendix a; Sirén 1980. 218–221; Sirén 2004. 200.
[12] Åström 1980; Lönnqvist 1978. 182–183; Sirén 1980; Hautala 2008.
[13] Åström 1980. 251.

can still call them Manor estates. Living in the centre of Finland, for example, were peasants and crofters whose life style was typified by farming methods such as burn-beating and living in cottages without chimneys, to which the Manor house, in comparison, appeared larger, airier, lighter and characterised by a totally different way of life.

There is a scarcity of information from historical sources concerning the household servants in the Manor houses. We have information on servant's wages – often money as well as personal necessities such as clothes and shoes – we have scant access to information on working hours, and we know in certain cases in which areas the servants had their houses; all of which provide clues to the problem at hand.

Concerning the servant's wages we know that they had wages in cash, and often even a set renumeration when they were first employed, as well as certain extra payments that in Karelen were called "presents" and "helpbread" and in Nyland "Christmas money".[14] These last forms of compensation as their names indicate that insignificant amounts were used as a small means to bind the servants to the estate. In addition, the cases when servants received articles of clothing and material for clothes it should be seen as a more personal sums – that were to be used for attire, and also often to provide clothing that denoted their position, for example, some sort of uniform for coachmen. These outward signs indicated that the servant in question had been given a role in the Manor household, which at the same time as it expressed their hierarchically lower position also indicated a sense of belonging, that is to say distance and closeness to the Manor House family.[15] Clothing can also be seen as an initiation into just that habitus that the family wished the servants to acquire.

When we use Mary Douglas's views concerning cleanliness and dirt and internal lines, that could only be transgressed ritually , we can also see these clothes as a means whereby the employees were thus transported from the natural position of "people" to "servant hood", or if one prefers it the individual was culturally taken into the Manor house community.[16] Through the clothing the individual acquired the cleanliness that made it possible for them to enter the inner zone of civilisation that the Manor house family saw themselves as representing, and of which the inner rooms of the Manor houses were the core. The wages paid were also a means of belonging to a financial economy and a sign of inclusion, a sign that was not given to the employed farmhands that were married; instead with their wages paid as in kind they were kept at a distance.

A spatial distance was maintained as regards the servants' living quarters. The maids could live in a maid's chamber and the farm hands in a farm hand's cottage, it was often arranged that the maids, as women, sometimes had their quarters inside the main building, while the agricultultural workers were relegated to a building in close proximity to the main building.[17] From Eastern Finland we also have accounts of the maids having their own abode during the summer. Similarly the farm workers had their own summer abode, (Ingilä in Jockas) or there were separate worker's buildings as on the estate of Liimatta outside Viborg, which had rooms both

[14] Åström 1977. 66–67.; Lönnqvist 1978. 127.
[15] Åström 1977.; Lönnqvist 1978. 129., 181.
[16] Douglas 1979. 122–123.
[17] Åström 1993. 84–85.

for the maids and the farm hands.[18] Here we see a significantly decreased distance being arranged for the staff of the Manor house as compared with to the agricultural workers, whose living quarters were often relegated so that their houses were built at a considerable distance from the main building and farm house, often in a hidden away place. They did not belong to the inner circle of household and garden servants and no one was concerned with their family lives.[19]

What we know about the housekeeper's and maid's rooms is that they were located in the vicinity of the kitchen and sometimes the children's nursery, this was natural as these were their primary workplaces. In some cases there were even separate buildings for the preparation of food, as was the case at Ratula estate in Artsjö, which has been researched by Bo Lönnqvist. Here, there was also an extended distance for the food to travel to the table, which I will return to later on.[20]

Concerning the living-conditions in general, we also know that the rooms were small, and that many maids shared the same room, and the furnishing was very meager. We can view it as though the servants, in their personal time during the nights, were relegated to a cramped and more common form of living, although usually clean and neat, as if to underline the neatness which was required in day-to-day life.

THE DAILY LIFE OF SERVANTS

The daily life of servants was regulated by a strict daily routine. An early rising was necessary as all the rooms in the house, for most of the year, had to be heated by lighting the fires. This was a time consuming procedure, which also made it necessary to enter the private bedrooms. Here the two categories met in the most intimate surroundings. Therefore, in the bedrooms prevailed the most intricate of relationships also because the master's personal hygiene was attended to in the bedroom. This involved the water for washing being carried in and out of the room, not to mention that the chamber pots and toilet buckets had to be emptied in the morning.[21] Here is the place for the first time to mention the role of artefacts in taking in charge of natural processes. Toilet items, jugs, and washing bowls and even some chamber pots were during the 1800s and long into the 1900s made of porcelain.[22] Porcelain as a very hygienic material indicates a loftiness and exclusiveness that was emphasised by the owner's families as denoting their position as being a very different species to the servants.

Here the requirement for womanly discretion was also a necessity. The family members had to, for the most part, treat the servants as if they did not exist, even though they were present in the most intimate of situations. Servants must make themselves socially invisible when they into the state rooms. Here the closeness and distance and similarly dependency and distancing were placed on a knife edge and a silent agreement, that the gentry despite their age must in certain circumstances by

[18] Åström 1977. 71. see also Härö 1978.
[19] Hautala 2008. 57–78.
[20] Lönnqvist 1988.
[21] Schauman 1978. 294.
[22] Åström 1993. Estaste inventories; Lönnqvist 1978. pictures 103, 104.

necessity be regarded as small children, must have been a solution. There was also a necessity for a categorisation of housekeepers and serving maids. Wet nurses and children's maids had their natural places in the area of the children and clothed the somewhat older children in a presentable fashion. When the morning's occupations were completed and everyone was ready for their further activities, a separation took place broken only by the different procedures concerning meal times.[23]

Food preparation, a procedure that Mary Douglas has studied thoroughly, involved natural food being prepared and served at a table for consumption. In the world of the Manor house this procedure appears to have been complicated. We have careful information about the procedure and preserved objects that shed light on the kitchen equipment and on the forms of serving the meals.[24] The Manor house kitchen had in many ways a similar function to that of any private home – it was the core of the house. Even in the cases where the kitchen was separate, which was especially typical in older times, and placed in a side building, it was nevertheless an important room. Here all the food was prepared, that is to say, as Mary Douglas indicates, the raw was transformed into the culturally acceptable. Cooked food can according to Douglas on the other hand be seen as liable to pass on pollution and this is why it was extremely intricate to be in charge of it.[25] When there were two distinct categories that occurred – the gentry and their servants – the first cultivation preparation or cooking of the food was not a sufficient purifying strategy, on the contrary, because of the danger of cooked food, only its serving made the food culturally clean to be consumed by the family.

In the Finnish Manor houses – as with the upper class families in the main – the way for the cultivation process was long – for example between the kitchen and the dining room there was a special serving room, where the food lost the last fragment of its natural or dangerous quality, the uncultivated. The tableware of the Manor houses, that is countless types of serving dishes – deep dishes – jugs – trays – illustrate the solemn journey made from the kitchen to the dining room, even on weekdays.[26] Porcelain elevated the food and, which is important here, it also cut off the link to the servants, whose hands had touched it and thereby had "dirtied" it from a social-cultural point of view.[27] Even the servants clothing also involved a ritual significance whereby the link to the foods origins was disconnected. The Manor house everyday housekeeping and food was very simple, but the social purification process was unavoidable.[28]

There is still testimony concerning the peripheral Finnish Manor houses that the relationship between nobility and servants was closer during the nineteenth century than later. This is certainly true in cases where the dining room was not used for meal times during weekdays, but meals were served in a small room off the kitchen, these chambers lay at a distance from the kitchen but not so far away, at least not in a

[23] Schauman 1978. 291–292, 294.
[24] Schauman 1978. 291–293; Lönnqvist 1988.
[25] Douglas 1979. 32–33.
[26] Schauman 1978. 292; Åström 1993. 381–388, appendix G
[27] Douglas 1979. 126.
[28] Schauman 1978. 292, 295–297; Lönnqvist 1988. 126.

social sense.[29] In such cases the family of Manor house gathered together there for their meals at a certain time, and when they were finished eating another serving took place at which the maids and other servants, such as visiting craftsmen, ate their meal together, after the masters and their children had left the room. We know that the time of the servings were separate and also know that the table wear was different for the different categories. The craftsmen fell into a middle category with their own table, better china, butter and a drink being provided with their food! This is once again in accordance with Mary Douglas findings in the caste system " since pollution is transmitted in the same row at a meal, when someone of another caste is entering, he is normally seated separately.[30] During the 20th century the servants hade their meals in the kitchen.

The older arrangements also had to do with the fact that some Manor houses did not have a separate dining room; the dining room or salon was – with the table pushed against a wall – sometimes reserved only for more grand occasions. In other Manor houses we know that the meal time process was always situated in the dining room and that the tables had to move several times a day from their place against the wall.

In comparison to the older customs from the 1700s, with their more or less mixed sittings, but with a difference in their procedure of the time and the table wear, the latter part of the 1800s had a much more space related difference with separate dining rooms becoming considerably more usual. The customs of the 1700s indicate here a categorisation that went back to an understanding of the inner household that had under normal circumstances had two variants: one when only the family were in residence and one when the Manor house had invited guests.

When guests were visiting the Manor house the dining room -salon and the more strenuous procedures were used. This meant that the separation and distancing of the family from the servants was more accentuated when they decided to extend the family associations with the other gentry and this demanded an excluding of those in a lower position such as those who served. In such circumstances, which must have been very common, as the Manor houses were constantly being visited by relations, visitors and travellers, and the number at meal times could often go up to twenty people – the delineation was very clear.

The older way of behaving implies that the Manor house could also shut down in a less pretentious fashion and with less clear boundary lines between the gentry and the serving class. The closeness did on the other hand not break the social hierarchy with its roles altogether, which means that the guest variation was the normative one.[31]

Other ways of maintaining the distance included a highly placed insistence on respecting titles, curtsying and bowing, and showing courtesy. The infringements that occurred – and that were, for example, referred to the courts – indicate that respect for the family of the Manor was an undisputable requirement. In the opposite direction i.e. from the owners side, they were permitted much licence, but not however if it went too far, which a court case from the beginning of the 1800s demonstrates. In this

[29] Åström 1998. 169–172.
[30] Douglas 1979. 33–34.
[31] Åström 1993. 190–194., 203.

case a Manor house owner had given two blows to the ears of an subordinate and was condemned, not for the first blow, which was deemed to be deserved, but for the second as one had been seen as enough.[32]

A strong line of delineation was also expressed through the different languages that were spoken on the Manor estates. In those districts where the local inhabitants were also Swedish speaking the difference was marked by standard Swedish as opposed to different dialects. As well as the necessity to use titles the difference in language seems to have been enough to maintain the distance necessary. In the areas where the local inhabitants were Finnish speaking, the world of the Manor house was naturally impenetrable for the underlings in a completely different way – and at the same for the Swedish Manor house family this included a normal sphere that was inaccessible. These language aspects were not unusual in Eastern Europe, where it was often German that had the authority and was the higher status language.

Knowledge of the written language was also a means whereby the nobility as a group could belong to a community that was not just local, whereas the category of the general population, before state schools, stood powerlessly outside this domain, and were bound to the local area.[33] Further knowledge of languages constituted an additional difference, apart form the distinguishing items and a clear distinction that signifies this was a question of two worlds meeting that were coming from different directions.[34] For the gentry there was also the position in the outside world that was manifested by journeys and the welcoming of guests, which in time with the development of a new national hierarchy also encouraged respect in the population. The Manor house owners were the de facto powerful category, not only because they were propertied and landowning but also because they were proprietors of power.

ROOMS AND THE TOOLS OF DISTANCING

In general, in the Manor house a strong set of taboo regulations were imposed covering different categories of servants. These included entrance, always via the kitchen entrance, waiting, in the kitchen to be called to some inner room, and in general actually never to enter a room other than for the purposes of carrying out a service or supplying a service. Other areas were also considered taboo, really the courtyard as a whole as well as the buildings around it, that were similar to wings. In eastern Finland one wing could also be a Community wing, set aside for farm hands and crofters that stayed overnight when they were doing casual work on the estate. In these buildings the entrance was usually out of sight of the Manor house. However, the placement of these buildings indicates a considerably closer relationship between the two categories than in Western Finland.[35]

One characteristic of the Finnish Manor houses was that intricate rules also concerned the Sauna buildings on the estate; this often led, in the middle of the 1800s, to there being two separate saunas or at least separate changing rooms.[36] This was

[32] Åström 1993. 301–304.
[33] Åström 1993. 240–244.
[34] Åström 1993. 355–359.
[35] Åström 1993. 75–87.
[36] Åström 1993. 80–81.

also an intimate sphere and so there were many obligatory taboo regulations. In cases where there was a common sauna it was a similar expression to the inner solidarity of the older everyday dining room. Separate bathing times and entrances were sufficient to mark such distinctions

The gardens of the Manor house were completely reserved for the use of the owners and their guests. The gardens were looked after with much care; this was the cultivation of nature, that with certain surprise elements and grand walks were a background for distinguished behaviour and the company of ones peers. The garden pavilions and view points were areas for entertaining where only guests were served.[37] The only cases where servants were allowed to enter were in connection with taking care of the garden, serving refreshments and looking after children. All this means that from the perspective of a space this was in the highest sense a place where the habitus of the gentry was enacted and where the servants habitus met – from the other side.

RITUALS AND THE BREAKING OF PSYCHOLOGICAL BOUNDARIES

Because everyday life was burdened with so many boundary mechanisms that internalised the preservation of the categories they became something that was perhaps experienced as belonging to the order of things. According to Pierre Bourdieu, the habitus of people is to a large degree unconscious and goes on being replicated until it meets some resistance. One way to both free oneself from the rigid drawing of boundaries, and at the same time strengthen them, can be done by the rituals of overstepping the boundaries. These can be seen as analogous with the earlier collective meal times, but they serve another function. Within the festival cycle of the year, such as Christmas and Midsummer the hierarchy was turned upside down, as it was at harvest time.[38] The harvest could be celebrated with a collective festival including the entire Manor house community when, for example, both the social and gender boundaries were broken – as when the countess danced with an subordinate or when the gentry served the servants at a meal.[39] These were ritual occasions when the owners' dependence on their servants was celebrated in a festive manner.

It was also a way of indicating who belonged to the small Manor house society. Outside guests were excluded and this small society celebrated on its own. Nevertheless the rules were decided by the owners, who established the rituals so that the following day they could again return to the everyday norms - which once again prevailed over the household. The festivities were a means of binding the participants to the estate before the coming year and thereby cementing the hierarchical norms. At certain manor houses a reciprocal relationship developed between the nobility and the servants so that the nobility also participated in their subordinates celebrations, for examples peasants' christenings and the organising of weddings for servant.

In his analysis of the Manor house at Ratula in Artsjö Bo Lönnqvist describes Manor house life through a lens that a person with double insight would have. His source's father was both a relative of the owner, and at the same time the manager of

[37] Lönnqvist 1988. 108–112.
[38] Lönnqvist 1988. 127–128; Sirén 1980. 219-221; Sirén 1985. 136–139.
[39] Åström 1993. 211–212; Reinilä 1978. 439–440, 492–495.

the estate with responsibilities for the subordinates working on the land. The family lived in a wing building.[40] The Manor house was ruled by the owner Countess Eugenie von Etter in addition to her husband, her ladies in waiting, chamber maids, housekeepers and guests – it was called the court. The servant grouping was unusually rich and their model probably came from St. Petersburg which the countess visited every winter, until 1896. The Countess von Etter was the youngest daughter of Alexander Armfelt, who was State Secretary in St Petersburg and therefore the leading statesman in the Grand Duchy of Finland. Alexander Armfelt in his turn was son to the famous Gustav Maurits Armfelt.[41]

Some information concerning the servants relationships at Ratula are in order here. The entire Manor estate was governed by a set of rules that had its starting point in the very character of the house and which spread out over the large park. The park was provided with various cultivated details, several pavilions, and an intricate pathway system 30 kms long, as well as an enormous park of hardwood trees.[42] Here a ritualistic lifestyle was led with picnics and coffee in the pavilions. Young girls were sent to the pavilions with washing baskets full of provisions. The countess however, arrived in her horse and trap. The older guests were also driven there, while the young had to walk.[43] Lönnquist speaks about the vertical principle that prevailed. The social hierarchy could be seen as either up or down, where the up was the mainbuilding, especially the first floor, and down was the kitchen regions. On the lower level, apart from the bedrooms and guest rooms, was the lower hall and as Lönnqvist writes *"with simpler furniture such as folding tables, wooden stools, kitchen tables and shelves, weaving stools, mangles, the inner and outer domestic rooms"*.[44]

Servants were at hand to serve, but even they were classed into ups and downs. In the main house lived two housekeepers, a bedchamber maid, "a second housemaid", while the downstairs housekeeper, the servants cook and the hen maid lived in the baking house – which was also the servant's kitchen. Here even the Swedish gardener manager ate together with the garden workers, the coachmen and the stable hands.[45] Concerning the characteristics of manor house life Lönnquist writes: *"When servants were brought up on the estate from children - some workers were already being their third generation – and when they then married each other, the manor community came to be characterised by a certain introversion. This guaranteed that the hierarchy that had been built up, and the structure of the command regime persisted as a self evident, unwritten law"*[46]

Bo Lönnqvist further relates about the daily routines, and how the family by the use of different lights – and brass instruments could call various categories of servants to them. The meal time bell indicated the time to the outside workers and how with certain small gestures – the countess usually gave sugar and cakes to the chambermaid every day when she brought in the coffee tray for the guests – as if say-

[40] Lönnqvist 1988. 110–112, 114.
[41] Lönnqvist 1988. 114–117.
[42] Lönnqvist 1988. 117–118.
[43] Lönnqvist 1988. 120.
[44] Lönnqvist 1988. 123–124.
[45] Lönnqvist 1988. 123–124.
[46] Lönnqvist 1988. 125.

ing *"you have your rightful place but I appreciate you"*.[47] It was important that the nobility were treated with respect, but also that they were worth this respect. During the civil war of 1918 the management family on this estate also went free because *"the management had never been hard or unfriendly to the servants"*.[48]

Here is an apparent way of solving the unsolvable paradox of being dependent and at the same time maintaining a hierarchy that was founded on just this dependency. One way of solving the paradox was to show that the family was worth the services they received and psychologically suggest that the help one received also served something greater, which the servants could also partake in maintaining and in which they could even find some kind of respect for their own role. In this way the Manor house, similar to a miniature society, could find its own worth, where each and every person had the feeling that they were serving something beyond just the owning families' interests. Through developing and forming the double habitus it was possible for the Manor community to create a psychological justification for each person to agree to the reciprocal relationship with its behavioural norms that applied to this society. Many Manor estates also made permanent efforts on behalf of their serving staff. They paid pensions, helped in cases of sickness, founded schools and overall pursued a policy of patriarchal well being.

The nobility could thus with their high positions, the beneficial nature of their activities to society and with their self restraint, function as models. When the owner of Sarvlaks returned from his deportation brought about by the Russian authorities after he had defied the Tsar's justice, the servants congratulated him with a silver vase 1905, as a token of their appreciation.[49] Those that represented the manor house could also choose to take on a visible role in the local society and in this way worked for the local community and become someone to identified with as role model. The Manor house cultures festive character and impressive symbolic language could also be something that one could submit to so as to thereby belong to something greater, to which your personal role also contributed. Thus, in addition in their own little role, everyone was partaking in the process of building up something larger than themselves.

The fact that the elite culture was dependent on a lower class must up to a certain point in history, involve the fact that such a hierarchical system was maintained with the servant class's collaboration. To obtain an explanation of how this could occur, we should go back to Pierre Bourdieu and his concept habitus, and also to what the material culture in a society can mean for its social reproduction. Bourdieu has shown that a cultures material forms can also be seen, in a certain way, as structural.[50] When one looks at the Manor houses and its functions in daily life there are many artefacts that are used daily, while others are cleaned, polished, and kept presentable. A strict ranking prevails showing high respectability, a sense of order, superior manners, beauty and taste. Those that in the final analysis are respon-

[47] Lönnqvist 1988. 127.
[48] Lönnqvist 1988. 130.
[49] Sirén 1980. 240–241.
[50] Bourdieu 1979. 81; Miller 1993. 105–106, 154.

sible for this are the owners and particularly the lady of the manor, which Angela Rundqvist so cleverly illustrate in her thesis Blue blood and lilywhite hands.[51]

Bourdieu suggests that the material world directly affects our unconscious mind and that especially after a strong conditioning process we are aware of every occasion when we overstep the unacceptable as regards the rules of the system and its conventions. Culture acts partly as a pattern and partly through the social action that people take.[52] This pattern is well known to the owners and through its enforcement they could maintain the culture. The pattern according to Bourdieu concerns such disparate spheres as catering/food preparation, kinship, myths and the boundaries between men and women. How culture is kept functioning even in its hierarchical form has to do, in an interesting way, with the concept habitus.

Because servants constantly perform the actions that need to be carried out for the maintenance of the rules, they participate very directly in the owners habitus, and really just as much as the gentry soon acquire many of the self evident conventions. It is typical of a habitus that it is imprinted into children and gradually becomes the "natural" opinion concerning cultural alignment and norms of the regulations that should prevail.[53]

Servants were conditioned into this habitus, even if their position was at a distance, reserved, subordinate and on the sidelines. From the sidelines and with the pattern constantly before their eyes the servants mostly knew how they should behave, so that everyday life ran smoothly, often in a very tangible way. It is via the material world that all socialising and conditioning takes place, asserts both Bourdieu and Daniel Millers, as a further contribution to the discussion on habitus, and opinions that are also in accordance with Jean Baudrillard's thoughts.[54]

The total content of artefacts in the Manor house became through their use, not only the servants working tools but also in a certain way even the servant's "own". It was a sort of framing the things that were part of the habitus on the manors. The things may not have be the same in different manor houses, but the referential system may have be almost the same.[55] Additionally, the arrangements of the inner sanctum of the large household, that is - who was responsible for which domains, was strictly regulated in a scheme, that had the owners habitus in mind, but which drew in the servant category, so that one could say that they did not just know the owners habitus but were also experts on certain of the regulation norms. According to Bourdieu habitus also had the characteristics that various parts of the cultural variants tended to assume a similar pattern.[56] In the Manor house pattern the *hierarchal principle* itself was inbuilt into the habitus – the configuration of the personal services demonstrated that the people at the top were worth this extra care. Daniel Miller further suggests that the pattern that is maintained via interactive processes in daily life quite literally produces a general form of familiarity.[57] The interesting point is that the

---

[51] Rundqvist 1989.
[52] Bourdieu 1979. 77; Miller 1993. 103–104.
[53] Miller 1993. 104
[54] Bourdieu 1979. 81; Miller 1993. 105–107; Baudrillard 1990.
[55] Radley 1991. 56–57.
[56] Bourdieu 1979. 143–158; Miller 1993. 104.
[57] Miller 1993. 103.

Manor house servants, who in no way belonged to the gentry's family, in a certain way were drawn into the familiar. As an unwritten law it was therefore deemed necessary for the relationship to be toned down, and transformed into its opposite, formality, giving titles, discretion and distance. In this way a hierarchical set of rules were practised that were always present.

Something which supports the fact that in the Manor house society it was often a question of some sort of "genuine familiarity" between the owners and the servants is also the pride servants could feel for "their" family, and also the cases where the strict distance was broken and a true friendship created. Daniel Miller strongly advocates the fact that we, with the help of things learn about culture and spread it further.[58] One could here point to the fact that the rich cultural mode of the Manor house was not an artificially created thing but it was a means above everything else by which the culture was maintained.

Lönnqvist has called the double habitus that I have put forward, cultural bilingualism, where the cook as a cook was a participant in the Manor house culture, and the owners through reducing their role could come closer to the lower class categories.[59] One could of course question whether and in which way a double habitus actually functioned in the Finnish Manor house communities or to what degree it did so. Our civil war, which Bo Lönnquist suggests was a watershed, illustrated that this was not always the case. In many instances, the servants turned against the owners, but the position of the personal servants was always ambivalent - they had to choose sides.[60]

The Manor house culture at the individual Manor houses was not independent from the ideological currents that favoured the overthrowing of the hierarchical principle. It was then in the cases where the habitus and a similar cultural bilingualism that stemmed from reciprocity with a human aspect, that confrontation could be avoided and life on the Manor estate could continue after 1918, in a modified form. Where the material differences were too great, it seemed that the common habitus did not function as a guarantee, which numerous Manor houses in the Baltic area and Russia were to experience. Here one can say that the restoration process that has occurred in the present time can only, via things, point to the life style that has disappeared.

In this article the position of the servants and their relationship to the material culture has been combined with a focus on rooms – and time dimensions, which are of enormous importance because it is through things, time and spaces that the Manor house culture could be carried forward. Here the artefacts that are included have belonged to various generations and they also have their given places and splendour: portraits and furniture point to the myth about the family owners. In order for the hierarchical habitus that prevailed to continue this aspect and its historical dimension was not unimportant. It was a question of a collective memory from the premises that the past could not be preserved as such, but a group could preserve and revive collective memories, especially when there were buildings and objects that could be used to

---

[58] Miller 1993. 103–104.
[59] Lönnqvist 1988. 139–140.
[60] Lönnqvist 1988. 129–130.

evoke these memories.[61] A reason for the continuing survival of Manor house cultures has certainly had something to do with a respect for the past powerful family dynasties, irrespective of the place one had in the hierarchy. Through the preserved items and objects we can still imagine this very different life style from ours today. Here the servants cannot be forgotten but form a very important element in this life style.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAUDRILLARD, Jean

1991 *Das System der Dinge. Über unser Verhältnis zu den alltäglichen Gegenständen.* Campus, Frankfurt.

BOURDIEU, Pierre

1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge Studies in social and cultural anthropology 16., Cambridge. (reprint 2002).

CSÍKSZENTMIHÁLYI, Mihály – ROCHBERG-HALTON, Eugene

1981 *The Meaning of Things. Domestic Symbols and the Self.* Cambridge U.P, Cambridge.

DOUGLAS, Mary

1979 *Purity and Danger.* Routledge& Kegan, London.

GIRTLER, Roland

1990 *Die Feinen Leute - von der vornehmen Art, durchs Leben zu gehen.* Campus Veritas, Frankfurt am Main.

HAUTALA, Camilla

2008 *De finska statkarlarna - en bortglömd folkgrupp? Bilden av en arbetarkategori i olika käällor.* Pro Gradu avhandling vid Åbo Akademi, Åbo.

HÄRÖ, Elias

1978 Byggnadsskicket, in: LÖNNQVIST, Bo ed. *Finländskt herrgårdsliv. En etnologisk studie över Karsby gård i Tenala* ca 1800–1970. Folklivsstudier XI. SLS, Helsingfors.

LÖNNQVIST, Bo ed.

1978 *Finländskt herrgårdsliv. En etnologisk undersökning av Karsby gård i Tenala ca 1800–1970.* Folklivsstudier XI. SLS, Helsingfors.

LÖNNQVIST, Bo

1988 Den ritualiserade vardagen. *Finskt museum.* 101–142.

1988 Ritualization of Daily Life. Life of the Gentry at Ratual Manor in Artsjö around 1900. *Ethnologia Europaea XVIII. 2.* 93–116.

MILLER, Daniel

1993 *Material Culture and Mass Consumption.* Blackwell, Oxford.

RADLEY, Alan

1991 Artefacts, Memory and a Sense of the Past, in: MIDDLETON, David –Edwards, Derek eds. *Collective Remembering.* Sage Publications, London, 46–59.

REINILÄ, Anna-Maria

1978 Livets och årets högtider, in: LÖNNQVIST, Bo ed. *Finländskt herrgårdsliv. En etnologisk studie över Karsby gård i Tenala* ca 1800–1970. Folklivsstudier XI. SLS, Helsingfors.

[61] Radley 1991. 52.

RUNDQVIST, Angela
1989 *Blått blod och liljevita händer. En etnologisk studie över aristokratiska kvinnor.* Carlsson, Stockholm.
SCHAUMAN, Marianne
1978 Livsföringen under 1900-talet, in: LÖNNQVIST, Bo ed. *Finländskt herrgårdsliv. En etnologisk studie över Karsby gård i Tenala* ca 1800–1970. Folklivsstudier XI. SLS, Helsingfors.
SIRÉN, Olle, Sarvlaks
1980 *Gårdshushållningen och gårdssamhället från 1600-talet till 1900-talet.* Folklivsstudier XII. SLS, Helsingfors.
SIRÉN Olle
1985 *Malmgård. Grevliga ätten Creutz'stamgods.* Folklivsstudier XVII. SLS, Helsingfors.
2004 Godsdriften och godssamhället ca1690-1950, in: DEGERMAN, Henrik – EDGREN, Torsten och SIRÉN, Olle eds *Stensböle i Borgå. En herrgård under 700 år.*. SLS, Helsingfors,
ÅSTRÖM, Anna-Maria
1989 Herrskapsfolk och underlydande, in: KORHONEN, Teppo and RÄSÄNEN, Matti eds. *Kansa Kuvastimessa. Etnisyys ja identiteetti.* SKS, Helsinki, 162–198.
1993 *'Sockenboarne'. Herrgårdskultur i Savolax 1790-1850.* Folklivsstudier XIX. SLS, Helsingfors.
1977 Den sociala strukturen på några karelska herrgårdar. *Finskt museum 1977.* 50–75.
1980 Statarsystemet i Jorois på 1900-talet. *Historisk tidskrift för Finland 3.* 245–260.